

on health care issues. What I remember is a kindly gentleman who was very active and involved in the issues of the day and who cared about other people. He taught adult Sunday school classes. He worked as a small businessman. He was a dedicated public servant, even as he felt that the Government had grown too big and was taking over too much authority.

It reminds me that, as we leave these places—and we all will—when you look back on it, there is a legislative career, and there are a number of legislative items that each of us are associated with, and the cares and concerns and the passions that we have of the day, but there is also a person who is there, and the soul and the character of that individual. In this case, Dr. Charlie Norwood had a beautiful soul. He was someone who touched people in a positive way. I am not sure you can say a lot more at the end of our days than that.

Congressman Norwood is survived by his wife Gloria, sons Charles and Carlton Norwood, and grandchildren, all of Augusta.

During his life, Norwood has served as a Member of Congress, longtime patients' and individual rights champion, dentist, Vietnam veteran, and small businessman.

Norwood, a seven-term Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1995 to 2007, served most of east Georgia at some point during his congressional career due to redistricting in 1996, 2002, and 2006. He won re-election every year since 1998 by landslide margins, and was elected to the 110th Congress in November by a 68 percent margin. His 10th District seat will be filled in a special election to be scheduled by Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue.

Norwood achieved national recognition after introducing the first comprehensive managed health care reform legislation to Congress in 1995, which subsequently passed the House of Representatives in both 1999 and 2001. Norwood's Patient's Bill of Rights legislation became a key issue in the 2000 presidential election, and will likely be revived in the 110th Congress.

Norwood was instrumental in health care reform for military retirees and veterans as well as patients-at-large. The former Army dentist was co-author of the Keep Our Promises to Military Retirees Act in 1999, which provided fully funded health care for life for the Nation's military retirees. The majority of the bill was enacted as part of the Defense Authorization Act of 2000.

In addition to his longtime national advocacy for patients, Norwood succeeded in passing reforms across a broad range of public policy areas, spanning education, private property rights, telecommunications, and environmental regulations.

Norwood is further recognized as the father of the Nation's current Class A broadcast television service, by authorizing and passing into law the Commu-

nity Broadcasting Protection Act in 1998.

In congressional oversight action, Norwood played a key role in the 1996–1998 Teamster's investigation, the 1998–2002 investigations of theft and fraud at the U.S. Department of Education, and the impeachment of former President Bill Clinton in 1998.

Norwood received a bachelor's degree from Georgia Southern University in Statesboro in 1964, and a doctorate in dental surgery from Georgetown University Dental School in Washington, DC, in 1967, where he was elected president of the Dental School Student Body in his senior year. He married the former Gloria Wilkinson of Valdosta in 1962 while attending Georgia Southern.

After dental school, he volunteered for the U. S. Army and served as a captain in the Dental Corps from 1967 to 1969, beginning with an assignment to the U.S. Army Dental Corps at Sandia Army Base in Albuquerque, NM. In 1968 he was transferred to the Medical Battalion of the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Vietnam, and served a combat tour at Bon Son. In recognition of his service under combat conditions, he was awarded the Combat Medical Badge and two Bronze Stars.

After Vietnam, he was assigned to the Dental Corps at Fort Gordon, GA, where he served until his discharge in 1969. Norwood was awarded the Association of the United States Army Cocklin Award in 1998, and was inducted into the Association's Audie Murphy Society in 1999. He remained a lifelong member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Military Order of the World Wars.

Dr. Norwood began private practice dentistry in Augusta immediately after his discharge. During his dental career, he served as president of the Georgia Dental Association and was a delegate to the American Dental Association.

In addition to his dental practice, Norwood also founded Northwoods Nursery in Evans, providing trees and shrubs to wholesale outlets throughout the Central Savannah River Area, and Augusta Dental Laboratory, which manufactured dental devices for patients.

He became a stalwart supporter of small business and property rights interests in Congress, receiving the 1995 Fighting Frosh award of the United States Business and Industrial Council, the Guardian of Senior's Rights Award of the 60 Plus Association, the Friend of the Family Award of the Christian Coalition, the Friend of the Taxpayer Award of Americans for Tax Reform, the Guardian of Small Business Award of the National Federation of Independent Business, the Spirit of Enterprise Award of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Thomas Jefferson Award of the U.S. Food Service Council, the Champion of Property Rights Award of the League of Private Property Owners, the Taxpayer's Hero

Award of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Taxpayer's Friend Award of National Taxpayers Union.

Dr. Norwood and his wife Gloria were longtime members of and taught adult Sunday school at Trinity-on-the-Hill United Methodist Church in Augusta. He was also a past board member of the Augusta Opera Society and a member of the Augusta Symphony Guild.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, are we now in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAL ID CARD

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if the Chair would please let me know when I have a minute left.

Mr. President, when we come back from the recess we are going to turn our attention to the 9/11 Commission recommendations which have been enacted by the House. I want to discuss an issue I hope will come up when we discuss the 9/11 Commission recommendations and that has to do with the so-called REAL ID card, the de facto national ID card.

This is a law that was enacted in early 2005. It was House-passed legislation that would require States to turn more than 190 million driver's licenses into de facto national identification cards, with State taxpayers paying most of the costs. I am not very much of a prognosticator. My predictions have never been all that accurate, but at the time of that passage, I objected to it.

The first thing wrong with the REAL ID law was that the House stuck the law into an appropriations bill that supported our troops in Iraq and sent it over to the Senate. None of us wanted to slow down support for our troops in Iraq while we debated ID cards, so it was stuck in there and we passed it. But the second and larger problem with what the House did 2 years ago, and which we agreed to and it became law, is that States not only got to create the ID cards, but they will likely end up paying the bill. I said to my colleagues, and at that time we had a Republican Congress: This is one more of the unfunded Federal mandates we Republicans promised to end.

Well, now we have moved ahead about 2 years, and I believe I have

turned out to be right about that. Just last month, the Maine Legislature became the first State to approve a resolution urging Congress to overturn the Real ID Act before it takes effect on the States in May of 2008. Only 4 of the 186 Maine lawmakers voted no. In the following other States there are bills, according to USA Today, that are considering asking us to overturn the law: Hawaii, Georgia, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Vermont, and Washington.

One reason they are asking us to overturn it is that according to the National Governors Association, implementing the law will cost more than \$11 billion over 5 years. We have provided \$40 million of the \$11 billion. That is an enormous unfunded Federal mandate.

The Presiding Officer is a former State official. I don't know if he had these same feelings when he was in his State of Colorado, but nothing used to make me madder when I was Governor of Tennessee than for some group of Congressmen to come up with a big idea, turn it into law, hold a big press conference, take credit for it, and send the bill to the States to pay for it. Then that same Congressman would usually be back home making a Lincoln Day speech, bragging about local control.

I am afraid that is what we have with REAL ID. It sounds pretty good maybe to say: Oh, we have a war against terrorism, and we have illegal immigration and other immigration issues. We need some sort of identification card that will make it possible to do a better job of fighting terrorists and impose the rule of law on our border. That sounds good, but there is a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it.

Here is what we should have done and what I hope we will do. I hope the week after next, when Senator COLLINS of Maine comes to the Senate, which I hope she will, and offers an amendment that will, in effect, set up a thoughtful process for, first, delaying the implementation of this bill and, second, give us a chance to consider all of its ramifications, I hope we will adopt that as part of the 9/11 Commission Report. In other words, give the idea of a national identification card the kind of thoughtful attention it deserves in the Senate.

No. 1, we should do it because it is a huge break with our tradition of liberty in this country. We do not have to look very far around the world—South Africa is the first place to look—to see the abuse a national identification card can cause. In South Africa, it was used to classify people according to race. Everybody had to have one. Everybody had to carry it around.

In this age of technology in a country that values liberty above everything else, there are a lot of questions about whether we should have a national ID card. Those ought to be explored in the Senate. We ought not push one through in a bill no one wants to vote against because it is primarily about supporting troops.

When I was Governor of Tennessee, I twice vetoed the photo driver's license which we all now carry around in our pockets. I did that, first, because I thought it was an infringement upon civil liberties; and, second, I did it because I thought what would happen was we would have lines around the block of people waiting to get their photo ID card—and that still happens sometimes—but I was gradually overruled by the State legislature and we got an ID card.

What helped getting overruled was when I showed up at the White House once to see the President at the National Governor's Conference and they asked to see my photo ID. I said: I don't have one. They asked: Why not? I said: Because I vetoed it. And I had to be vouched for by the Governor of Georgia. The push for this was law enforcement saying it would help with check cashing and other identification.

While as a liberty-loving country, we say we do not want a national ID card, at the same time, we have allowed a de facto national ID card. That is a State driver's license. We have over 190 million of these. We all know the de facto driver's license ID cards are very ineffective. They are easily duplicated, they are often stolen, and we go around not just using them to prove we can drive, but we use them to get on airplanes, we use them to cash checks, and we use them to get a passport. They are not an effective ID card.

I have reluctantly come to my conclusion. Despite the fact I vetoed those early ID cards, on September 11, one way our world has changed is we do need a national ID card. Maybe our discussion in committees would show we do not want one but that we want authorized two or three forms of identification cards which meet certain standards which can be used for different ways.

For example, there could be a travel card that one could use to get on an airplane. If you had that travel card that allowed you to get on the airplane, you might use it for other purposes, as we have come to use the driver's licenses in that way or we might use the passport. About a quarter of Americans have passports, 68 million Americans. That is one form of an ID card though not as common as 196 million driver's licenses. There is also the Social Security card. My initial instinct is that a Social Security card that had the proper technology attached to it would be the wisest, the most effective, and most useful ID card because most of the immigration problems we have are related to work, either as a student or as a worker. It would be natural to have an ID card, to have a Social Security card such as the card we carry around in our pockets that also serves as a de facto national ID card.

There was a case of the Swift Company, which was using, under our antiquated immigration laws, the basic pilot program, which is what we say to businesses to use if we want them to do everything they can to make sure they

are only hiring people legally in the United States. Swift and other companies do that. Even if they do that, they cannot be assured that the people they are hiring are legally here because many of the Social Security numbers have been stolen, as it turns out, and it is against our laws to inquire too far into someone who applies for a job and presents evidence they are a citizen. Our laws say you cannot ask more questions to second-guess that.

We have some work to do. All of us who think about the immigration issue—which is what brought all this up, along with the September 11 disaster—we think of the immigration issue and we think of the need for employer verification. For employers in this country to verify that people they hire are legally here, we are going to have to supply those employers, in some way, with the ability to ask for a good identification card. Perhaps it is the Social Security card, perhaps it is a travel card, perhaps it is a passport, perhaps it is a bank card, maybe there are two or three of those. That might be a way to avoid having a single card and could diminish the concern about civil liberties. Or maybe the needed ID is the driver's license, but I doubt it is the driver's license.

Certainly, we should not expect the men and women in the Tennessee Department of Public Safety who are in charge of issuing a few million driver's licenses, to be turned into CIA agents whose job it is to catch terrorists. I don't think they are expected to do that. They are not prepared to do that.

What we will be requiring is the citizens of the various States to show up to get their driver's license or a renewal with different forms of identification, some of which they may not have. It will be a very expensive process and a big mess. My first impression is that the State driver's license system is not the best place to look if we want to create an identification card.

Here is my suggestion. My suggestion is we pay close attention to the Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, when we come back after the recess. She has a thoughtful recommendation to the Senate which suggests, over the next couple of years, we have time to look at this issue of whether we need a national identification card and what kind of identification card we might need. I hope the hearings would be held this year in the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and the Judiciary Committee or whatever the appropriate committees might be, and then we might deal with this issue in the immigration bill which I hope we pass this year.

We need a comprehensive immigration bill. That bill needs to have an employer verification system. I don't see how we can have an employer verification system without a good form of identification card. I hope we will deal with this in the way the Senate normally deals with issues; that is, through its committees, considering all

of the options. In the meantime, we have the Real ID law in place with the estimate that it may cost up to \$11 billion, a huge unfunded mandate. We have States saying we are going to opt out of that program. If they do, that means the citizens of Maine or Montana or some other State will not be allowed to fly on airplanes, for example, because they will not be from a State that has an approved ID card. That will create a lot more confusion and a lot more angry constituents.

I am here today to wave a yellow flag, to remind Members of the Real ID issue. It may not be part of the 9/11 Commission recommendation when they come to the floor, but it is relevant and certainly germane. I hope the Senator from Maine will provoke a discussion of it, and we will move to delay its implementation until we can think this through and do it right.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article I wrote for the Washington Post on Wednesday, March 30, 2005, about the Real ID and my views.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 2005]

MUCH AS I HATE IT, WE NEED A NATIONAL ID
(By Lamar Alexander)

The House recently passed legislation requiring states to turn 190 million driver's licenses into national ID cards, with state taxpayers paying most of the cost.

The first thing wrong here is that the House stuck the ID card proposal on the appropriations bill that supports troops in Iraq and sent it over to the Senate. We should not slow down money for our troops while we debate ID cards.

The second problem is that states not only get to create these ID cards, they'll likely end up paying the bill. This is one more of the unfunded federal mandates that we Republicans promised to stop.

Supporters argue that this is no mandate because states have a choice. True, states may refuse to conform to the proposed federal standards and issue licenses to whomever they choose, including illegal immigrants—but if they do, that state's licenses will not be accepted for "federal purposes," such as boarding an airplane. Some choice. What governor will deny his or her citizens the identification they need to travel by air and cash Social Security checks, or for "other federal purposes?"

Of course, the ID card may still backfire on Congress. Some feisty governor may say, "Who are these people in Washington telling us what to do with our drivers' licenses and making us pay for them, too? California will use its licenses for certifying drivers, and Congress can create its own ID card for people who want to fly and do other federally regulated things—and if they do not, I will put on the Internet the home telephone numbers of all the congressmen."

If just one state refused to do the federal government's ID work, Congress would be forced to create what it claims to oppose—a federal ID card for citizens of that state.

Finally, if we must have a better ID card for some federal purposes, then there are better ideas than turning state driver's license examiners into CIA agents. Congress might create an airline traveler's card. Or there could be an expanded use of U.S. passports. Since a motive here is to discourage illegal

immigration, probably the most logical idea is to upgrade the Social Security card, which directly relates to the reason most immigrants come to the United States: to work.

I have fought government ID cards as long and as hard as anyone. In 1983, when I was governor of Tennessee, our legislature voted to put photographs on driver's licenses. Merchants and policemen wanted a state ID card to discourage check fraud and teenage drinking. I vetoed this photo driver's license bill twice because I believed driver's licenses should be about driving and that state ID cards infringed on civil liberties.

That same year, on a visit to the White House, when a guard asked for my photo ID, I said, "We don't have them in Tennessee. I vetoed them." The guard said, "You can't get in without one." The governor of Georgia, who had his photo ID driver's license, vouched for me. I was admitted to the White House, the legislature at home overrode my veto and I gave up my fight against a state ID card.

For years state driver's licenses have served as de facto national ID cards. They have been unreliable. All but one of the Sept. 11 terrorists had a valid driver's license. Even today, when I board an airplane, security officials look at the front of my driver's license, which expired in 2000, and rarely turn it over to verify that it has been extended until 2005.

I still detest the idea of a government ID card. South Africa's experience is a grim reminder of how such documents can be abused. But I'm afraid this is one of the ways Sept. 11 has changed our lives. Instead of pretending we are not creating national ID cards when we obviously are, Congress should carefully create an effective federal document that helps prevent terrorism—with as much respect for privacy as possible.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, President John F. Kennedy was fond of quoting the Biblical passage of the New Testament:

For unto whomsoever much is given of him shall be much required.

That was quoted from the 12th chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke, verse 48, the King James version.

When I think of that passage, I think of the life, the career, and the accomplishments thus far of my dear friend, my dear friend and colleague, Senator TED KENNEDY, who will turn 75 years old—Oh, to be 75 again—he will turn 75 years old, on February 22. The Senate will be out of session on February 22.

When TED KENNEDY came to the Senate in 1962, I would already have been here 4 years. So when he, TED KENNEDY, came to the Senate in 1962, much had already been given to Senator TED KENNEDY. He had been born into a wealthy and remarkably, remarkably talented family. His father, a financial genius, had been an Ambassador to England—think of that, Ambassador to England—and the very first Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

One of his brothers, one of TED KENNEDY's brothers, had been a Senator—I can see him now, as it were—and was then President of the United States, but had been a Senator. Another brother

was the Attorney General of the United States, and would eventually join TED in the Senate in 1965.

As for Senator EDWARD "TED" KENNEDY, himself, he had attended two of our country's premier educational institutions, Harvard College, and, yes, the University of Virginia. And he, TED KENNEDY, had already accumulated a lifetime of political experience by the tender age of 30 when he came to this Senate. How remarkable—just burst upon the landscape. I remember. Therefore, as the Scripture tells us, we had a right to expect much from TED KENNEDY when he came to the Senate. We had a right to expect much. What about our expectations? He delivered. He delivered.

In the Senate, TED KENNEDY became the heart and the conscience, yes, of American liberalism. And he has been one of the most effective—I know. I have been here. I have watched him. I did not particularly like him at the beginning. He did not like me. Each of us knew that. We did not care who else knew it. It did not matter.

In the Senate, Senator KENNEDY became the heart and the conscience of American liberalism. He has been one of the most effective national legislators—read the RECORD; read the history of the Senate—he has been one of the most effective national legislators of the 20th century. And as one who knows something about American history and the history of the Senate, he has been one of the most effective national legislators of all time in the Senate. I have not lived all time, but I know something about all time. I know something about the Senate and know something about the history of the Senate.

TED KENNEDY has been one of the most effective national legislators of the 20th century or of all time as far as this Republic stands. His imprint is on nearly every piece of progressive legislation crafted during the past 45 years. I will read that again. I want to make sure I believe that myself. His imprint is on nearly every piece of progressive legislation crafted during the past 45 years: the Occupational Safety and Health Act, OSHA; the Voting Rights Act; the Age Discrimination Act; the Freedom of Information Act; the Americans with Disabilities Act; health care reform; increases in the Federal minimum wage. These are but a few of his, TED KENNEDY's, legislative monuments. Additionally, he has been among those few at the very forefront of promoting women's rights and women's equality.

He, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, TED KENNEDY, is the Senate's Mr. Health Care. He is the Senate's Mr. Civil Rights, to a great extent. He is the Senate's Mr. Human Rights. As his Senate record reveals, Senator KENNEDY is a man—a Senator—of remarkable compassion, who has labored mightily on behalf of his fellow citizens.

Although born to a life of privilege, TED KENNEDY has dedicated his life—if